A NEW USE OF INDIAN CORN—USING CORN FOR FUEL.—A farmer in Illinois, on the Grand Prairie, where wood is not to be had and where coal is worth thirty cents a bushel, and corn the same, got out of fuel while the roads were so bad that he could not haul coal, and in the emergency of the case tried burning corn in the ear in his stove in place of coal, and found that it not only succeeded but that it was actually cheaper to burn corn than coal, and that it not only makes a hot fire but a cleaner one than coal.

We were quite aware of the value of corn cobs and corn stalks for fuel, but this is a new use of the grain, though we see no reason to doubt that an article so full of oil and alcohol must make good fuel, and not very expensive.

APPOINTMENTS BY THE GOVERNOR,
By and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

NOTARIES PUBLIC.—NEW-YORK—John Van Tenpool, S. L. Woodford, J. B. Stevens, Henry Heedden, Theodore Stuyvesant, Charles Hoffman, Frederick W. King, Edmund Stevenson, John Edwards, John Townsend. WESTCHESTER—Charles J. Hunt. CHENANGO—James Thompson, Lama Ingersoll. MADISON—William H. Kinney. CHAUTAUQUE—James Delvin. ONEIDA—L. L. Lewis. SUFFOLK—Philander R. Jennings, William C. Hawkins, John O. Ireland, Sidney S. Norton, Seth R. Clark, Tuthill Dayton, William H. Gleason, James H. Tuthill, Edward Oakley, George H. Shephard, Geo. D. Cooper. CAYUGA—Jay L. Dory. SCHENECTADY—William L. Goodrich.

LOAN COMMISSIONERS.—DUCHESS—Wm. Thomas, Joseph D. Hunt. WESTCHESTER—Samuel C. Merritt. MADISON—Benjamin P. Clark, Albert N. Sheldon. ERIE—Almon M. Clapp, Myron Stillwell. CHATAUQUE—Stephen Snow. JEFFERSON—Joseph Fayal, John C. Cooper. OSCEOLA—Lorenzo Rouse. WAYNE—Clark Mason, Solomon Upson. CAYUGA—Charles Campbell, Henry Winard. TOMPKINS—John H. Selkreg. BROOME—Elias Patrick, Marvin P. Smith.

TROOPS FOR NICARAGUA.—On Sunday, the steamship Louisiana took over 104 volunteers, bound from Western Texas to Nicaragua, under the lead of Major W. C. Capers, Capt. Marcellus French and Lieut. Jackson. We mixed among them for an hour or two, having an acquaintance with most of them, and do not hesitate to vouch for their soldierly bearing in their field of destination. They are men who have smelt powder, and will fight like tigers whenever occasion requires. The citizens of San Antonio contributed some $500 toward their outfit, and other places aided in the good work. Though their stay here was but a few hours, and that on the Sabbath, some means were raised to help them along. A number of the young men attended the different churches, probably thinking it would be the last opportunity for some time. It was gratifying to see them do so. These brave men with the best wishes of those they leave behind, will leave New-Orleans on the Texas next Thursday. [Galveston Civilian, 24th ult.

New-York Daily Tribune

THURSDAY, MARCH 12, 1857.

A murder was committed yesterday morning in Worth-street, near Hudson-street—an Irish woman of alleged bad character, having her throat cut by, as is supposed, a West Indian negro sailor. The alleged murderer has been arrested and committed to prison by the Coroner.

The receipts of beef cattle for the week ending yesterday were nearly double the receipts of the week before—that is, 4,016 against 2,100 head; but, as will be seen by our market report, the increased supply did not materially reduce the price, since everything fit for city market retailing brought prices equivalent to 11 or 12 cents per pound for the beef; while very choice animals sold at prices equal to 12½ or 14 cents. It is a common thing now-a-days to see whole droves of bullocks sell for over $100 per head, while single animals often bring $150 to $200 each.

A dispatch from New Orleans gives a rumor from Aspinwall, dated March 3, that Col. Lockridge had forced his way up the San Juan River and captured a steamer and some arms and ammunition.

The ultra Pro-Slavery faction at Washington, having succeeded in keeping Lecompte on the bench, have now taken in hand the removal of Geary. Accounts from Washington state that this is warmly pressed upon the President; and from his treatment of others who have done him good service in the Presidential canvass, it is thought he will throw Geary overboard and supply his place with some fire-eater.

The Senate of the United States was yesterday involved in a discussion which had some features of tragedy, more of comedy, and still more of farce. In the first place, the two bogus Senators from Indiana, whom everybody knows to be no more entitled to seats on that floor than Mazzini or Fred. Douglass, are acting, voting and taking pay as if they were really Senators, and the political majority of the Senate are taking precious good care that their enjoyment of place and pay shall not be disturbed. In full view of these facts, the Senate engaged, or pretended to engage, in the consideration of the right of Mr Cameron of Pa. to his seat; when they might as well have questioned that of Henry Wilson or Gov. Seward. Carolina Butler hit the nail exactly on the head in saying that, if there was really corruption in the Legislature of Pennsylvania, it should be scrutinized and ferreted out there, where (if anywhere) the evidence and the power to try exist; not in Washington, where nothing could be proved, and nothing done if ever so much were proved. Mr. Cameron was probably right in characterizing the Harrisburg protest as a humbug, in which the authors were never serious. The synopsis of his speech will be found most suggestive. In fact, the whole debate, though it resulted in nothing, will richly repay a perusal.

NEW-HAMPSHIRE has honored herself in her recent Election. One year ago at the close of a most excited contest and upon the largest poll the State had ever known, the Opposition Governor had a plurality of barely 88 votes, while 2,360 were cast for the "Old-Line Whig" candidate. The Opposition barely carried the Legislature, though the Kansas Question was directly before the People, and the Presidential Election in prospect. Now, with Mr. Buchanan just inaugurated, both Houses of the next Congress fixed against us, the Supreme Court virtually outlawing us, and the Doughface press everywhere asserting that "bleeding Kansas" has ceased to suffer, the Republicans, on a moderate poll, carry every branch of the State Government by some Three Thousand majority, reëlect their three Members of Congress, and thus show to the world that the Republican spirit of the Free States is buoyant and invincible.

Divers newspapers of the Democratic and Dark-Lantern species are howling grievously at the audacity of those free people who dare to doubt the omniscience, the infallibility and the absolute disinterestedness of the Justices of the Supreme Court of the United States; and we are sorry to say that here and there a journal, from which we had a right to expect a manlier course, is weak enough to be deluded into the language of acquiescence. It is assumed that Judges, because they are Judges, must always be in the right; that they are so far elevated above the level of ordinary mortality that we not only must not question—nay more, that it is absolutely treason to question the correctness of their decisions; that all we have now to do is to fold our hands and submit without a murmur. Our readers have ere this discovered that we are under the control of no such abject idolatry; that we regard even that awful creature, a Chief Justice, as a human being, and that we do not mean to submit slavishly to fraud and usurpation because the ermine is interposed to cloak their character. If there be any censure to bestow, let it fall, in the name of the eternal equities, upon those who have dragged their official robes in the kennels of slave-breeding politics! When we are ready to surrender sense and reason, conscience and intellect, and all pretension to mental and physical freedom; when we are ready to beslaver Bomba with praise, and to write the panegyric of the little Napoleon; then, and not till then, will we get on our knees to Roger Taney.

The acquiescent gentlemen say nothing very original—nothing, in fact, which has not been uttered in all ages by the apologists of bad judges and the spaniels of despotic courts. "This is the law," they say, "and to the law you must submit." This might be very conclusive if we were Medes or Persians; or if a judicial decision had never been reversed, and was incapable of revision. "What do you intend to do about it?" chimes in chorus the whole pack. That is a fair question, and we will answer it plainly. We mean to show that this Dred Scott decision is deficient in every element which should entitle it to respect—that it violates the truth of history and the logic even of the law; and in our humble way, we mean to assist in getting it overruled. If that be treason, our carping critics must make the most of it. It is a treason in which Justices McLean and Curtis are equally implicated with ourselves. Both these gentlemen—and more rigorously conservative judges never existed—said distinctly that they did not consider the decisions of the Court to be binding upon questions not legitimately before it. The opinions of both these able men are before the public, and we do not believe that a single unprejudiced lawyer, who values in the least his professional reputation, will deny that the dissent of these judges is sustained in a way which does not leave the slaveholding magistrates a leg to stand upon. If we must admire and praise Supreme Justices, we prefer to be allowed to use our own discretion, and when tribunals differ, to select the side which shall have our support.

One would think, to read this fulsome flummery in the newspapers, that there had never been such a phenomenon as an unjust judge, whereas there is not a schoolboy who does not know that history is full of them—that even in English annals corrupt tribunals have been the rule and not the exception—that Bacon took bribes, that the Judges of the last Stuarts were cruel, oppressive and venal to the last degree, and that even since the accession of the House of Hanover, there has been more than one Judge as heartless and tyrannical as he dared to be. There are, indeed, the Hales, the Holts, the Mansfields, and noble exceptions do they furnish; but there too are the Scroggs, the Jeffreys, the Eldens and the Norburys. The State trials of England are black with judicial insolence, ferocity and oppression. Is anybody deterred now from saying what he thinks of these monsters by the fact that they wore the regulation robes and wigs? And must we, while contemplating a great crime, hold our peace because those who have committed it happen to be living?

The position of an upright Judge who tempers the austerities of the law, and who has the heart to appreciate the large opportunities of his vocation, is one which is entitled to the respect of all good men. But a bad, a narrow-minded, a passionate or a prejudiced Judge, is the greatest curse which can be inflicted upon society. We say frankly that we do not believe that this Dred Scott decision, the most important ever given in that tribunal, could have been wrenched from magistrates who were not under the undue influence of Slavery, and thinking so, we shall say so. It has come to a pretty pass, indeed, if this Court, created by the people, is to be considered as entirely above popular criticism as incapable of error, as utterly irresponsible. If this were so, we might as well give up the executive and legislative branches of the Government at once. Not so thought Jefferson, whose name is always in the mouths of Democrats, and who utterly denied the right of the Court to construe the Constitution for the coördinate branches aforesaid.

We hear much of the dangers of agitation. We admit them; but we know of another danger far greater, and that is the danger that our liberties may be subverted, our rights trampled upon, the spirit of our institutions utterly disregarded, and our great republican experiment turn out a disastrous failure. We confess that this danger particularly occupies our mind just about this time.

The citizens of the State of New-York will naturally feel some curiosity as to the exact position occupied by Mr. Justice Nelson in the Dred Scott case. That position is somewhat peculiar, and to understand it, we must give a brief history of the claim of Dred Scott to freedom, and how the question happened to come before the Supreme Court of the United States.

The question of the effect upon the civil status of a negro once a slave carried by his master into the State of Illinois, and kept there for a sufficient time to become free under the laws of that State, came before the Supreme Court of Missouri as early as 1824. In that year it was decided in the case of Winny vs. Whitesides (1 Missouri Reports, 473), that a negro slave carried from North Carolina to Illinois, and there residing in the family of her late owner, became free by the laws of Illinois; and that the subsequent removal of the family, the late slave included, to the State of Missouri, did not revive the right of ownership or destroy the liberty acquired under the law of Illinois.

In 1828, in the case of Lagrange vs. Choteau (2 Missouri Reports, 28), it was held that under the Ordinance of 1787 any sort of residence in Illinois, permitted by the owner of a slave, was sufficient to work an emancipation. In Julia vs. McKinney (3 Missouri Reports, 370), the Supreme Court of Missouri held that the temporary letting out to service in Illinois, for one or two days, of a slave by her owner, was sufficient under the Constitution of Illinois to entitle her to freedom. In 1836, in Rachel vs. Walker (4 Missouri Reports, 350), a case came before the Supreme Court of Missouri still more exactly to the point. Rachel, the plaintiff, who claimed her freedom, had been bought in Missouri by an officer of the United States Army; had been carried to Fort Snelling, on the west side of the Missouri River and north of the State of Missouri; had been kept there a year; had then been removed to Prairie du Chien on the east side of the Mississippi River, then included in the Michigan Territory, and after having been kept there three years, had been brought to the State of Missouri and sold. The Court held that she was doubly free—made so under the operation of the Missouri Compromise Act by virtue of her residence at Fort Snelling, and under the Ordinance of 1787 and its subsequent reënactment by Congress by her residence at Prairie du Chien—and that her being brought or coming into Missouri did not again reduce her to slavery.

Such was the law, and such was the exposition of the law in a series of decisions made by the Supreme Court of Missouri, under which Dred Scott claimed his freedom and that of his wife and children. In 1834 Dred Scott, being a slave in Missouri, was taken by his owner, an officer in the United States Army, to Rock Island, in Illinois, whence, in 1836, he was removed to Fort Snelling. He there found Harriet, whom he presently married, and who, having been a slave in Missouri, had been brought the year before to Fort Snelling by her master, also an officer in the army. In 1836 the Supreme Court of Missouri pronounced the above-cited decision in the case of Rachel vs. Walker, according to the doctrine laid down in which case both Dred and Harriet at the time of their marriage were free persons. The issue of this marriage were Eliza, born at Fort Snelling, and Lizzy, born in Missouri, to which State the whole family had been removed in 1838, and where they were held and claimed as slaves. As their title to freedom was perfectly clear under the above cited decisions of the Supreme Court of Missouri, a suit to establish their freedom was commenced in the State Courts, which finally, in 1852, came before the Supreme Court. But the decision then rendered by that Court gave painful evidence of that relapse toward barbarism and the perpetuation of Slavery, which, within the past twenty years, has become so alarmingly apparent, not merely in the legislation but in the judicial decisions of all the slaveholding States. It used to be the boast of Southern Courts and lawyers that all their leanings were toward freedom, and that all claims of freedom judicially made were sure to be favorably entertained. Such undoubtedly used to be the case. Beside the cases above cited from the Missouri Reports, the Reports of Virginia, Maryland, Kentucky, and even of Louisiana, afford strong evidence of this leaning toward freedom. But, commencing with the State of Mississippi, and the infamous decisions rendered there, the idea that the policy of the South should be that of the perpetuation of Slavery has spread black and rapid as a Summer's thunder-cloud over the judicial horizon of the South, and the State Courts are now seen striving, as it were, to outdo each other in seeking to render the condition of Slavery hopeless; and to that end are now artfully evading, and now boldly trampling under foot, their former decisions.

In the case of Dred Scott, Mr. Gamble, the Chief Justice of Missouri, being a man of some conscience and consistency, adhered to the former decisions of the Court, and pronounced Dred Scott and his family to be free. The majority of the Court refused to sustain Scott's claim, on the newly taken ground that, however he and his family might be free by the law of Illinois, they as Judges of Missouri were under no obligations of comity or otherwise to enforce the laws of Illinois. Comity, they insisted, was a matter merely of discretion, and times not being as they were when the former decisions were rendered, they considered themselves released from any obligation to pay any regard to those decisions! The Supreme Court of Missouri having thus refused to protect him in his liberty, Dred Scott brought his suit in the Circuit Court of the United States for the District of Missouri, whence the case finally came before the Supreme Court at Washington.

And now for Mr. Justice Nelson's position in relation to the doctrines put forth respectively by the majority and by the minority of that tribunal. In a single word, his position is that of a skulk. Knowing Mr. Justice Nelson's antecedents as we do, we must set it down rather to want of courage than to any lingering sentiments in favor of freedom and humanity that he did not follow the example of Mr. Justice Grier in going the whole hog with the slaveholding members of the Court. But the same lack of courage operated, also, to prevent him from risking the displeasure of his owners by affecting, in any representative character on behalf of the North, sentiments and ideas which do not appertain to his moral and intellectual nature, and which, indeed, he could hardly have attempted to express without breaking down under the unaccustomed burden. He, therefore, looked about for some loophole through which he could slip, so as alike to escape the lash of Northern indignation and the being snubbed or having his ears pulled by his Southern associates on the bench. As to all the points brought forward in the opinion of the majority, he is perfectly mum. Even on the question whether Dred Scott, being a negro, could sue in a Court of the United States, he has not a word to say. He concurs, indeed, with the majority of the Court in their judgment dismissing the appeal, but on a ground peculiar to himself, and to which they did not refer. He takes the ground that the freedom or slavery of Dred Scott is a question exclusively of Missouri law, and that, having been decided by the Supreme Court of Missouri, the Supreme Court of the United States has nothing to do but to conform to that decision!

Yet the very ground upon which the Supreme Court of Missouri base their decision would seem imperatively to demand the interference of the Federal Court. The Missouri Court admits that by the laws of Illinois and by the Missouri Compromise Act, Dred Scott and his family are free; but they say that, being a Missouri Court, it is none of *their* business to enforce the law of Illinois and the enactments of Congress in relation to the territory north of Missouri and west of the Mississippi. As an act of comity, they might do it; but being at the moment in a fit of ill humor, they won't. If that does not make out a case for the interference of the Federal Judiciary, we should like to have Mr. Justice Nelson inform us what could! Even if this had been purely a question of Missouri law, the decision of the Supreme Court of Missouri would have been in no way binding on the Supreme Court of the United States. This point is well disposed of in a decision of the Supreme Court made scarcely a year ago. In the opinion of the Court in that case (Pease vs. Peck, 18 Howard, 589) the following passage occurs:

"There are, it is true, many dicta to be found in our decisions averring that the Courts of the United States are bound to follow the decisions of the State Courts on the construction of their own laws. But although this may be a correct yet rather strong expression of a general rule, it cannot be received as the annunciation of a maxim of universal application. Accordingly, our reports furnish many cases of exceptions to it. To all cases where there is a settled construction of the laws of a State by its highest judicature, established by admitted precedent, it is the practice of the Courts of the United States to receive and adopt it, without criticism or further inquiry. *When the decisions of the State Court are not consistent*, we do not feel bound to follow the last, if it is contrary to our own convictions—and much more is this the case where, *after a long course of consistent decisions, some new light suddenly springs up, or an excited public opinion has elicited new doctrines subversive of former safe precedent.*"

The last paragraph describes exactly the position in which the Supreme Court of Missouri stands. But the claim of Dred Scott to freedom was not a case arising under the laws of Missouri. It was, and the Supreme Court of Missouri admitted it to be, based on the Constitution of Illinois and an act of Congress. But Mr. Justice Nelson seems to be of opinion that it is only State laws and acts of Congress for the benefit of slaveholding with the enforcement of which the Supreme Court of the United States has anything to do.

We hope that the Legislature will take some action with regard to the Marine Court of this city before the close of the session. Three bills are pending, two of which assimilate this august tribunal, in respect of the service of process and the nature of pleading, more or less closely to the Superior Courts of the State, while one sweeps the whole concern out of existence. The latter was introduced by Mr. Varnum, who has fathered many useful reforms; to both the former the Hon. Erastus Brooks stands sponsor.

Mr. Brooks's bills are but stepping-stones to that which had best come at once, if at all. By the broadest possible construction of a series of statutes, conferring more or less jurisdiction, and by "assuming doubtful powers," in accordance with Mayor Wood's immortal maxim, the Marine Court has gradually, almost from the moment of its birth into an unappreciating world, been creeping up in power, if not in grace, until its worshipful Justices now affect to pronounce final judgments, after the manner of the Court of Appeals, in what they call a General Term, and to say for themselves who shall and who shall not practice before them. One of Mr. Brooks's bills, by allowing a summons to be served by the Sheriff on any one not a party, makes the Constabulary force, which has hitherto ornamented the vestibule of the Marine Court rooms, of no further utility, and by requiring parties to serve written complaints and answers, puts an end to the good old fashion of telling the story on each side *viva voce;* thus sweeping away the last vestige of the chrysalis condition of a Justice's Court from which the Marine Court emerged into its present glory. In the natural order of things, if this bill passes, volumes of Marine Court reports will soon appear, wherein counsel, in case Barbour should by any chance fail them, may find plenty of bad law wherewith to bolster up a hopeless argument. By that time at least the Board of Supervisors will have granted the prayer of the modest gentlemen who wear the Marine Court ermine, by raising their annual salaries to $5,000; and the Legislature will have taken it into its head to break down all still existing limitations upon their jurisdiction.

However groundless such prophecies as these may seem to persons who are not well read in the history of the Marine Court, those who are will readily admit the probability of their fulfillment. Our fear is that these steps will be so stealthily taken that half the lawyers even may not be aware that the goal has been reached until it is too late, and they find themselves practicing before men whom they never met at the Bar. If the Marine Court is to be erected into a tribunal of the highest class and the most extended jurisdiction, it strikes us as in all respects desirable that its elevation should be the work of one Legislature. The change should be a single one, but should be postponed till a new Bench can be formed. For who would think of conferring the powers of the General Sessions upon Justice Connolly's Court, without first giving Justice Connolly leave to withdraw? Who would be for giving the Coroners authority to try persons whom they suspected of murder, while Coroner Connery and his fellows remained in office? And what sane man would dream of clothing Justices Thompson, Maynard and McCarthy—all excellent fellows, no doubt, and good hands at a hundred-dollar case involving no legal question—with similar powers to those possessed by Judges Oakley, Mitchell, Ingraham, and their associates? The thing is exquisitely absurd. No tribunal which resembled the lowest Court in the State in point of dignity, learning and judicial wisdom, while it was on a par with the highest in all other regards, could command the respect of the community for an instant. No: let us have no such bills as those of Mr Brooks. If the thing is to be done, 'twere best it were done as a whole, and not piecemeal, and that it were done in such a way, and hedged about with such conditions as to really, not nominally, create a new Superior Court in this city.

But, in our judgment, the true step to be taken is that pointed out in Mr. Varnum's bill. The Marine Court should be abolished at once. It is worse than useless, for it intercepts many suits which, but for its existence, would stand some chance of reaching a tribunal where law could be applied to their adjudication. Latterly, the doubt, not yet wholly settled, regarding its jurisdiction and powers has deprived many suitors of their legal rights, and begotten litigation that has filled lawyers' pockets and beggared their clients. Besides, there is no need of a new Court of Record in this city. Three civil tribunals, exercising substantially the same jurisdiction, are enough. If they cannot dispose of our business, give them more judges, and keep giving until there are as many as can well work together. The fewer the courts the fewer the volumes of conflicting decisions, the more work is done, and the less the expense.

Mr. Varnum's bill provides for the appointment of three additional Judges of the Court of Common Pleas, which has but three on its bench now. With six, it could do as much work as the Superior Court, which has that number; having, like it, one Special, one General, and two Trial terms in session all the time. So many Judges might not, however, be needed for some years to come—as the Common Pleas work is now comparatively light, and the influx of business consequent upon the decease of the Marine Court could not be overwhelming.

If the Marine Court insists upon existing, let its General Term be abolished forthwith; let it be stripped of all its fine feathers and remanded to its original condition where it may devote its faculties to the settlement of controversies touching seamen's wages—an appeal in all cases to lie from its judgments. But we are inclined to think Mr. Varnum's bill, or something very like it, to be the true remedy for the case; and we believe that nine-tenths of those who know the facts hold the same opinion.

Nature intended the kingdom of Naples for a paradise—tyranny, Jesuitism and diplomatic treachery make it a pandemonium. Nearly every steamer from Europe brings news of fresh outrages in that wretched region, committed by a frantic King and his cowardly minions. Persecutions, arrests, cruelties manifold, are the order of the day. The saturnalia of fear are more violent and frequent since the attempt of Milano on the life of the blood-reeking Ferdinand; but, above all, since the attempt of the Western Powers, and of England especially, miscarried. Ferdinand of Naples outdoes Louis Napoleon, if not in the number of imprisoned and expatriated victims, certainly in cowardice and raving. It seems that he, his Court, and his advisers and directors, have reached the utmost verge of frenzied fear, and now strike blindly for new objects of vengeance. Terror-stricken, they continue uninterruptedly the drama of cruelty and treacherous tyranny which has placed the Government of Naples even beyond the pale of that of the Pope, Austria or France.

The news brought by the Persia announces that, among other acts, the police have seized the papers of General Prince Filangbieri of the Prince Ischitella, both formerly ministers, and of several others who seem to be their friends and partisans. Thus the persecution reaches those who not long ago enjoyed power and themselves abused it in behalf of this wretched tyrant. Filangbieri, cunning, keen and ambitious, seeing, in January, 1848, that the Liberal current was irresistible, himself turned Liberal and advised the King to proclaim the Constitution, to arrest and banish the Marquis Delcaretto, the bloodiest enemy and executioner of the Liberals. Thus Filangbieri was, so to speak, the godfather of that short epoch of freedom, and the head of the moderate party. He subdued the revolution in Sicily and became Prime Minister, but under his administration Poerio the martyr, and other liberal patriots, were thrown into prison and tortured. So now Nemesis overtakes them! The persecution of these moderates proves that the despotism is daily more crushing and revolting even to those who once served it. Those cunning moderates, however, would not have dared to give signs of dissatisfaction, or to favor any kind of secret schemes, without being incited or encouraged from without. The moderates are those who believe in England. In the year 1848, the same men, with other liberals and Filangbieri at their head, received their inspirations at the English Embassy represented by Lord Napier, then a Chargé at Naples, and now Minister in our country. During the last year, the English Government and English emissaries fomented discontent in Naples and stirred up hopes which they never intended to justify.

So it has often been, and many a nation with aspirations and hopes for liberty has been thus betrayed by the English Government, and especially by Lord Palmerston and *The London Times*. *The Times* coolly avows that the Government wished to push matters to a sharper extremity at Naples, but then receded for reasons of its own. The plain truth is, that Palmerston stirred up the hopeful and intrigued with the discontented in Naples to frighten the King into submission. But now, for other political reasons, such as friendship for Austria, and so forth, he becomes less exigeant as regards Ferdinand, and abandons to his regal mercy those who suffer in prison, and those who bent a willing ear to the treacherous insinuations and menacing demonstrations of England. Where shall we find words burning enough to brand the tergiversations of such a statesman?

The Commercial Advertiser is waking up to the tremendous and far-reaching consequences of the Supreme Court's decision in the Dred Scott case. The following statement is frank and lucid:

"Now there is no concealing the fact that under this decision the rights which the Free States have all along believed themselves to possess, are denied and can no longer be recognized. They have supposed that it was their prerogative to prohibit Human Slavery within their territories; that they could declare, and carry out their declaration, that a slave brought voluntarily by his owner, within their borders should thereby be freed from bondage, especially when they met the requirements of the Constitution by surrendering fugitive slaves, and the requirements of good brotherhood by publicly announcing that any slaveholder bringing his slave or slaves into their territory would do it at his own risk. They believed they had just as much constitutional right to say, 'You shall not bring your slaves into our State,' as they had to say, 'We will return your slaves if they escape into our State.' According to the decision now made, all this has been wrong. New-York has no such power. The Federal Constitution requires not only that she shall return the fugitive slave who seeks refuge in her territory, but that if a slaveholder brings into any of her cities or towns a whole retinue of slaves, she shall protect him in his ownership of them, as she would in the ownership of so many horses or oxen.

"Unless we have mistaken the tenor and extent of the decision, and we do not think we have, any of the following consequences may result from it. A. B., from Louisiana, may bring his family to New-York City, with as many slaves to wait upon them as he chooses. He may stay with them a month, a year, or five years, so long as he is always *about to return;* or he may himself pass to and fro, retaining his residence in Louisiana. C. D. may also come from South Carolina, under similar circumstances and with a similar retinue, and the number of slaves settled in the city, and to be protected and otherwise treated as property, may be indefinitely increased. Then A. B. may sell a part of his slaves to C. D. Or C. D. and himself disagreeing about the price, he may advertise that he has such slaves for sale to any gentleman from either of the Slave States, and where they may be seen; for the right of property involves these rights. And if under the decision it may still be within the Constitutional power of the State to prohibit her own citizens from buying and selling slaves (which may be doubted so far as any practical assertion of such power is concerned), yet under that decision slaveholders *in transitu* might thus convert this Empire City into a slave-mart."

—*The Commercial* may rest assured that the people of the Free States will find some way to protest against this monstrous usurpation, and to make that protest effectual. It is bad enough that we are made slave-catchers against our will; we will not consent in like manner to be made slaveholders. The conscience and the self respect of the Free States will vindicate themselves in spite of the recent decision and a dozen like it.

We gladly give place to the communication of "A Wife and Mother," which appears on another page, in defense of hoops. In the matters of convenience, ease, health, and above all of presentability in the esoteric sense, of course the "wife and mother" must be the judge and the masculine critics of no weight whatever. So far, however, as appearances are concerned, these lookers on at the Venuses may have a word to say; and with that gallant deference to the sex which is our characteristic, and in fact for which we are proverbial, we must affirm that the circle of some of the hoops is too extensive—the periphery of the lovely orbit overplussed—with no gain thereby, but a superb swag and amplitudinous agony engendered calculated to act upon the rowdier sex as the London police do on a hadmiring Henglish haudience when the latter cluster round their Queen in Buckingham Palace yard—that is, to effect a general retreat before so much majesty, and a firm belief that great is the Diana of the Ephesians. The final allusion with which the "wife and mother" perfumes her bouquet of protestation is of itself all-sufficient to render dress-hoops as imperishable circles as those of the rich and rolling vagrants of the skies. Great Necessity—mother of Invention and grandmother of the Patent-Office—thus comes into the arena and lays down the law beyond possibility of denial or dispute.

Gentle beings, then, stick to the hoops! What are you to Hecuba (Eugénie), or Hecuba (Eugénie) to you? If the restoration of the fashion which erst adorned the White House in Washington when it was red brick in Philadelphia, and when Martha Washington received Kentucky traveling hunters and Gallic exiled kings, and received them in hoops, while the Pater Patriæ gave *place aux dames*—as the triumphant Boones and crushed Bourbons were lumped together by the law of a streak of fat for a streak of lean—when all this flourished, and much more which, to describe, would make this sentence too long and prevent our coming out of it with whole rhetorical bones—if the restoration of such a fashion shall enable ladies "to appear one-fourth of the year" with physical grace, moral beauty and poetic ecstasy, severally at the Academy, Stewart's or Grace Church, then by all manner of means let hoops be worn!

"Who fashioned all her gorgeous shirts?
Who sewed the buttons on my shirts?
Who every little right asserts?
My wife!

"Who ran to help me when I stumbled?
Who raised me gently when I tumbled?
Who flogged me soundly when I grumbled?
My mother!"

The "wife and mother" carries the day. Hoops forever! Hear and tremble. A special coinc.

A letter from our Kansas correspondent under date of Feb. 12, which we published some days since, contained the charge of a plot or scheme on the part of the Government land officers in Kansas to put Pro-Slavery squatters in possession of the Shawnee lands previous to the opening of those lands for settlement and in exclusion of the Free-State settlers. The fact of such a plot is fully confirmed in a letter from Westport dated Feb. 20, published in *The Richmond Enquirer*. The following are extracts from this letter:

"The most exciting topic in these parts at present is the settlement of the Shawnee Indian lands. By treaty, a reserve from Kansas River south 24 miles, and the Missouri State line west 30 miles, comprising the richest and most beautiful portion of the Territory, was set apart for the settlement of old Tecumseh's band, each Indian being entitled to his choice of 200 acres; the residue, computed to be 30,000 acres, open to preemption by the whites. Lying immediately on the Missouri line, it is very important that it should not be settled by Yankees. Thus a rush, until not a claim is left; and now, viper-like, they are quarreling among themselves as to who shall hold a certain claim.

"When the Black Republicans come on this Spring, all the lands of much value will be entirely taken up—for the most part by our friends, who are moving out every day, to be in time to get claims near the border, where there is wood and water. Indeed, there will be no room, unless they choose to stick down upon a high, dry plain, destitute of wood and water, a desert soil,